have provided to civilian and military users, the new aircraft which they introduced, and the stimulation which * * * they have afforded the all-purpose carriers, all indicate that renewal of all-cargo carriers will serve the public convenience and necessity.

"We think it is clear that both the all-purpose and the all-cargo carriers have peculiar advantages and can make special contributions to the industry. In our judgment, the development of a system of cargo transportation adapted to the Nation's needs will best be accomplished through their combined efforts."

I am in wholehearted agreement with these statements by the Board. There is a vital necessity for the continuation and preservation of the all-cargo carriers. They have stimulated the development of air cargo. They have pioneered new aircraft and new techniques.

The Aviation Subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee and the Board have worked closely in the past to achieve a well-balanced air transportation system through the issuance of certificates to both large and small airlines and to encourage the development of new areas of air transportation. One of the results of this joint effort and interest has been the creation of different classes of carriers such as the all-cargo carriers and the supplemental carriers.

I am greatly disturbed by the impending crisis which threatens the balance achieved in our system and which could bankrupt the all-cargo carriers and the supplementals. Unless steps are taken soon to open greater business opportunities for these two groups of carriers, I am afraid the progress of many years will be lost. That is why some action by the Board is so imperative.

The Defense Department recently reviewed its policy in connection with the MATS procurement program and has now awarded its fiscal 1965 MATS contracts. I understand that the Board was consulted in connection with the review of policy. Although the Defense Department affirmed the wisdom of the Presidentially approved courses of action which were implemented by the Air Force in 1960 and has indicated its intention to continue that policy, it appears that certain other factors have changed significantly the allocation of the total MATS business among the competing carriers. And this is the business upon which supplementals and all-cargo carriers must now rely primarily, until commercial carriage can be secured in greater amounts.

Among these factors are (1) the reduction in rates recently approved by the Board, (2) the addition of many new jet aircraft to the program, and (3) the awarding of contracts to airlines which previously did not participate in the MATS program. For fiscal 1965 alone the above three factors will result in a reduction of about 50 percent in the per jet aircraft allocation and about 30 percent in the per CL-44 allocation. The total amount of MATS business for fiscal 1965 is reduced from $145 to $129.2 million. Thus, the share which will go to those carriers which did not add new aircraft in 1964 has been cut drastically.

The Defense Department has also put into effect specific rules to implement its previously announced policy with respect to using air carriers which have an appropriate balance between civil and military business. For fiscal 1966 the MATS contracts will be awarded in such a way that the carriers who receive contracts will derive at least 30 percent of their revenue from commercial sources. The Defense Department goal is for the carriers in the near future to derive 60 percent of their revenue from commercial sources. While this is a laudable policy and one with which I am in general agreement, I am concerned about the 30- and 60-percent rules, particularly the timing of their implementation. The carriers which will be affected most severely by this policy are the all-cargo carriers and the supplementals. The combination trunk carriers with their big passenger income have no worries in meeting even more than the 60-percent commercial income test.

The supplementals will also lose this year another source of revenue—their individually ticketed business. One of the all-cargo carriers has lost almost all of its mail revenues as a result of another change in Defense Department and Post Office Department policy regarding the allocation of oversea military and civilian mail transported by air. Of course, domestic all-cargo carriers have never participated to any great degree in the movement of mail. Postal rules effectively preclude their participation.

I know that the Board is familiar with these developments, as well as others, but I state them to apprise you of the specific problems which trouble me. Among other things, the Congress has vested in the Board the authority and imposed upon it the duty to encourage and develop our air transportation system according to the needs of our commerce, the postal service and the national defense, to foster sound economic conditions and to maintain competition. As one Member of Congress I feel that I should make known my views in this public forum for consideration by the Board.

The malady of the supplementals and the all-cargo carriers cannot and should not be approached as a subsidy matter. These carriers are ineligible for subsidy and should so remain. The solution lies in opening up new avenues of commercial revenue for them so they may compete on a fair and effective basis with combination carriers for a slice of the aviation dollar. The Board must study and consider new approaches which can be taken to remove the operating restrictions presently imposed on these carriers. These carriers must be granted an exclusive niche in the airline industry and a part of the overall traffic must be reserved for them alone. The Board's consideration of the amendments to parts 207 and 399 is a start in this direction.

Without additional promotion by the Board it is unlikely that these classes of certificated and congressionally authorized carriers will have sufficient revenues to survive as sound, safe, and profitable carriers. They have acquired modern turbine powered equipment for the military which they will have difficulty in paying for on drastically reduced military contracts. It is unlikely that any repossessed aircraft would remain in this country as part of the CRAF program. It is also improbable that these carriers will be able to meet the military 30 percent and 60 percent requirements, assuming a normal market growth and no change in existing operating authority.

Ways and means must be found to enable these carriers to increase their commercial business and to obtain profitable business. I do not know whether the proposed amendments are the answer. But it is an encouraging sign that the Board is giving consideration to some change which will give relief. The Board should also investigate through actual proceedings the feasibility of granting supplementals the right to sell all-expense tours along the lines being used so successfully in Europe. The Board should work closely with the Department of Defense in matters relating to the award of MATS contracts. Without stable and sound supplemental and all-cargo carriers the strong Civil Reserve Air Fleet built in recent years will vanish. Further, the Board and the Post Office Department should reexamine all existing rules and regulations affecting the movement of mail. These rules preclude all-cargo carriers from obtaining anything but a miniscule amount of mail. In particular, a joint Board-Post Office study should be made to determine whether it would be advantageous to sell all-cargo services at low bulk rates for the carriage of types of mail now moving on time-consuming service routes.

The Board must do now whatever it can within the power vested in it by Congress. If that power is insufficient, recommendations should be made to the Congress requesting authority to take whatever steps are needed.

The Board and Congress have declared a need for these carriers. They perform a function vital to the maintenance of a balanced transportation system. Every appropriate effort must be made to provide a sound base for the growth of these classes of carriers by assigning them separate and select functions in the airline industry. It would be tragic in the extreme that having qualified for certificates of public convenience and necessity, these carriers should have the Board turn its back on them and fail to show any concern over whether they survive or die.

SECRETARY RUSK URGES NEW IMMIGRATION LAW

Mr. HART. Mr. President, yesterday the Secretary of State the Honorable Dean Rusk, testified before a House subcommittee on the urgent need to reform and modernize the outmoded Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952.

The Secretary's appearance is an event of importance. It is the first time in several years that a Secretary of State has appeared before Congress to support long needed reform in America's method of selecting immigrants.

The Secretary's statement is forthright and articulate, a lucid statement on the need for reform. It puts on the line, especially, the adverse effect the national origins quota system, basic in our immigration law, has on the operation of our foreign policy.

At one point the Secretary reminds us, that "what other peoples think about us plays an important role in the achievement of our foreign policies."

He continues:

We in the United States have learned to judge our fellow Americans on the basis of their ability, industry, intelligence, integrity, and all the other factors which truly determine a man's value to society. We do not reflect this judgment of our fellow citizens when we hold to immigration laws which classify men according to national and geographical origin. It is not difficult, therefore, to understand the reaction to this policy of a man from a geopraphical area or of a national origin, which is not favored by our present quota laws. Irrespective of whether the man desires to come to the United States or not, he gets the impression that our standards of judgment are not based on the merits of the individual—as we proclaim—but rather on an assumption which can be interpreted as bias and prejudice. Inasmuch as our immigration laws are regarded as the basis of how we evaluate others around the world their effect on people abroad and consequently on our influence, can readily be seen.

Later the Secretary states:

What is needed, basically is to bring our immigration laws into line with the real character and disposition of the American people, who are at heart and in fact hospitable, kindly disposed and interested in all races and cultures. This is so because we know from actual experience that immigrants previously admitted, regardless of race and place of birth, have made their distinctive contribution to what is America today.

Mr. President, Secretary Rusk is to be commended for his excellent statement. It is my understanding that others in the executive branch will testify shortly, including the Attorney General. Here we see the administration giving firm leadership in a significant area of public policy.

I would hope that we in Congress will proceed expeditiously to consider the pending legislation, S. 1932 and H.R. 7700. The companion bills have broad support on both sides of the aisle and throughout the country. Their passage would put on the books an immigration law which befits our tradition and ideals. It would mark a great achievement for the American people.

Mr. President, I hope Secretary Rusk's statement will be widely read. I ask unanimous consent that it and an article entitled "Change in Immigration," written by Howard A. Rusk, M.D., and published in the New York Times of July 5, 1964, be made a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE DEAN RUSK, SECRETARY OF STATE, ON THE ADMINISTRATION'S PROPOSALS FOR AMENDMENT OF THE IMMIGRATION LAWS (H.R. 7700 AND S. 1932), BEFORE THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY SUBCOMMITTEE, THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate this oportunity to appear before you to discuss a very important problem. I refer to the effect on the operation of our foreign policies of the national origins system which is the basis of our immigration laws.

The administration has proposed in H.R. 7700 and S. 1932 the progressive elimination of the national origins system from our immigration laws. I should like to discuss with you the foreign policy aspects of our immigration laws and of the administration's proposals from the point of view of the Department of State. Others will discuss internal or national aspects of the administration's proposals.

Under the national origins system, the primary objective was to maintain the ethnic balance among the American population as it existed in 1920. This system preserves preferences based on race and place of birth in the admission of quota immigrants to the United States. This results in discrimination in our hospitality to different nationalities in a world situation which is quite different from that which existed at the time the national origins system was originally adopted.

Since the end of World War II, the United States has been placed in the role of critical leadership in a troubled and constantly changing world. We are concerned to see that our immigration laws reflect our real character and objectives.

What other peoples think about us plays an important role in the achievement of our foreign policies. We in the United States have learned to judge our fellow Americans on the basis of their ability, industry, intelligence, integrity, and all the other factors which truly determine a man's value to society. We do not reflect this judgment of our fellow citizens when we hold to immigration laws which classify men according to national and geographical origin. It is not difficult, therefore, to understand the reaction to this policy of a man from a geographical area or of a national origin, which is not favored by our present quota laws. Irrespective of whether the man desires to come to the United States or not, he gets the impression that our standards of judgment are not based on the merits of the individual—as we proclaim—but rather on an assumption which can be interpreted as bias and prejudice. Inasmuch as our immigration laws are regarded as the basis of how we evaluate others around the world their effect on people abroad and consequently on our influence, can readily be seen.

There have been times in the past when we have been accused of preoccupation with the peoples of the West to the neglect of Asian peoples in the Far East. Unfortunately, the national origins system gives a measure of support and credence to these observations.

Actually, Mr. Chairman, we are not quite as prejudiced as we sometimes appear. Congress has progressively liberalized our immigration laws to permit the reunion of families. We admit the native born from our sister Republics in the Western Hemisphere on a nonquota basis without discrimination as to origin or place of birth. Congress has also found it desirable over the years to pass special laws providing for the admission, generally on a nonquota basis, of immigrants of different races and circumstances who have been uprooted and displaced by political upheavals.

In these special laws we have exhibited a generosity of spirit and a complete absence of concern about the origin, race and place of birth of the refugees whom we have admitted to our shores under circumstances of need.

I don't have to remind you, Mr. Chairman, and the members of the committee, of the fine record Congress established in passing the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, the Refugee Relief Act in 1953, and the "Fair Share" Refugee-Escapee Act in 1960. These acts, for all practical purposes, exempted refugees from the quota restrictions which would have delayed their entry into this country for many years.

More recent legislation has clearly reflected the intent of the Congress to relieve pressures created by quota restrictions. On five separate occasions since 1957 the Congress granted nonquota status to quota immigrants who had been waiting for visas for an extensive period of time. While I shall not indulge in a statistical presentation, I should like to remind this committee that, as a result of this liberalizing policy of the Congress, only 34 percent of the 2,599,349 immigrants who came to the United States from 1953 through 1962 were quota immigrants.

What is needed, basically, is to bring our immigration laws into line with the real character and disposition of the American people, who are at heart and in fact hospitable, kindly disposed and interested in all races and cultures. This is so because we know from actual experience that immigrants previously admitted, regardless of race and place of birth, have made their distinctive contribution to what is America today.

President Kennedy, in a special message to the Congress on July 23, 1963, said:

"The most urgent and fundamental reform I am recommending relates to the national origins system of selecting immigrants. Since 1924 it has been used to determine the number of quota immigrants permitted to enter the United States each year. Accordingly, although the legislation I am transmitting deals with many problems which require remedial action, it concentrates attention primarily upon revision of our quota immigration system. The enactment of this legislation will not resolve all of our important problems in the field of immigration law. It will, however, provide a sound basis upon which we can build in developing an immigration law that serves the national interest and reflects in every detail the principles of equality and human dignity to which our Nation subscribes."

President Johnson in January 1964 said:

"This bill applies new tests and new standards which we believe are reasonable and fair and right. I refer specifically to: What is the training and qualification of the immigrant who seeks admission? What kind of a citizen would he make, if he were admitted? What is his relationship to persons in the United States? And what is the time of his application? These are rules that are full of commonsense, common decency, which operate for the common good.

"That is why in my state of the Union message last Wednesday, January 8, 1964, I said that I hoped that in establishing preferences a nation that was really built by immigrants—immigrants from all lands—could ask those who seek to immigrate now: What can you do for our country? But we ought to never ask: In what country were you born?"

The administration's proposal would eliminate the national origins system on a gradual basis by reducing all established quotas by 20 percent each year for 5 years. The present total of quota authorizations would be maintained, except initially all minimum quotas and subquotas would be increased from 100 to 200. These minimum quotas would have the 20 percent reduction each year applied to them.

A quota reserve pool is established by section 2 of the bill before the committee under which all numbers would be allocated by the fifth year. In each of the 5 years constituting the period of transition, the pool would consist of (1) the numbers released from national origin quotas each year, under the 20 percent progressive reduction plan and (2) numbers assigned to the old quotas but unused the previous year because insufficient demand for them existed in the assigned quota area.

Experience has shown that we have approximately 50,000 visa numbers annually which are unused and are not available for reallocation to other quota areas. These unused numbers are chiefly from the United Kingdom and Irish quotas.

In the fifth year all quota allocations would be made from the quota reserve pool which would then become a worldwide quota. So that no one country could enjoy a disproportionate amount of numbers from the pool based on registrations or relatively long-standing, the bill provides that no one country could receive more than 10 percent of the total authorized quota numbers.

A strict first-come, first-served basis of allocating visa quotas would create some problems in certain countries of Northern and Western Europe, which under the national origins system enjoyed a situation where quota numbers were readily available to visa applicants.

To apply the new principle rigidly would result, after a few years, in eliminating immigration from these countries almost entirely. Such a result would be undesirable, not only because it frustrates the aim of the bill that immigration from all countries should continue, but also because many of the countries so affected are our closest allies.

At a time when our national security rests in large part on a continual strengthening of our ties with these countries, it would be anomalous indeed to restrict opportunities for their nationals here. Therefore, the bill allows the President to reserve up to 50 pefcent of the pool reserve for allocation to qualified immigrants, who could obtain visas under the present system, but not under the terms of the bill before the committee, and whose admission would further the national security interests in maintaining close ties with their countries.

Also involved in this is the issue of our immigration policy toward Asian persons, to which I now wish to address myself. Perhaps the most discriminatory aspect of

the present law is the so-called Asia-Pacific triangle which requires persons of Asian stock to be attributed to quota areas not of their place of birth but according to their racial ancestry. This feature of the present law is indefensible from a foreign policy point of view. It represents an overt statutory discrimination against more than one-half of the world's population. Here again our request is not that the Congress drastically depart from existing policy, but rather that it pursue to a conclusion a development which began more than 20 years ago. As your Committee is well aware, the Congress, at the request of President Roosevelt, eliminated in 1943 the Chinese exclusion laws and established for the first time a quota for the immigration of Chinese persons. This well-considered and cautious beginning of a revision of our policy of excluding Asian persons has been followed by progressively liberal amendments to our laws. In 1952, the drafters of the Immigration and Nationality Act eliminated race as a bar to naturalization and thereby to immigration. Asian spouses and children of American citizens were given the same nonquota status as enjoyed by any person of non-Asian ancestry.

The only discriminatory features affecting Asian persons which then remained were the establishment of an upper limit of 2,000 for the so-called minimum quotas in the Asian area, and the rule that the quota of an Asian person born outside the Asian sphere be governed by ancestry, rather than by place of birth. The Congress in 1961 removed the 2,000 limit on the number of Asian immigrants from minimum quota areas. The only remaining discriminatory provision of the law now, therefore, is the one requiring that an Asian person be charged to an Asian quota even if he were born outside the Asian area in a quota or nonquota country.

The restrictive effect of this rule has been significantly tempered during the last decade as a result of the special legislation to which I referred earlier. The very liberal policy which found expression in these special measures, as distinct from the letter of the general law, is best illustrated by the volume and composition of immigration from some of the major countries of the Far East. During the 10-year period from 1953 to 1963 a total of 119,677 immigrants came to the United States from China, Japan, and the Philippines; 109,654 of these were nonquota immigrants and less than 10 percent were quota immigrants. These facts may startle those who read in our immigration laws that Japan has an annual quota of 185, the Philippines a quota of 100, and that China has a total of 205 quota numbers a year. Any increase in the volume of immigration resulting from the proposed amendments would be rather limited against the actual volume of Asian immigration into the United States between 1953 and 1963. We deprive ourselves of a powerful weapon in our fight against misinformation if we do not reconcile here too the letter of the law with the facts of immigration and thus erase the unfavorable impression made by our old quota limitation for Asian persons.

I urge you most earnestly to eliminate this last vestige of discrimination against Asian persons from our immigration laws. This action would bring to a logical conclusion the progressive policy the Congress has followed since 1943.

Consistent with the foregoing, I should like to urge you to accord equal status to all immigrants born in our American sister republics. It has always been the policy of the Congress to recognize the common bond uniting the Americas by exempting from any quota restrictions those immigrants who were born in independent countries of the Western Hemisphere. When the Congress in 1952 formulated the pertinent provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act it included in the list of nonquota countries all those which were independent at that time. Meanwhile, our neighbors in the Caribbean, Jamaica, Trinidad, and Tobago, have become independent. The wording of the law required that we proclaim for each of these areas quotas of 100. We have had serious representations from these countries concerning these quota restrictions which are interpreted as discriminatory measures. Jamaica and Trinidad are among our best friends in this hemisphere and their friendship is of considerable significance to us.

Assistant Secretary Mann will expand upon this in later testimony. Mr. Abba P. Schwartz, Administrator, Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, will also present a statement on the refugee aspects of the administration's proposal.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, without going into the economic aspects of the administration's proposals, on which others will testify, I wish to conclude with a few general considerations.

Present-day immigration is very different in volume and makeup from the older migration on which most of our thinking is still based; and its significance for this country is considerably different. Immigration now comes in limited volume and includes a relatively high proportion of older people, females, and persons of high skill and training.

The significance of immigration for the United States now depends less on the number than on the quality of the immigrants.

The explanation for the high professional and technical quality of present immigration lies in part in the nonquota and preference provisions of our immigration laws that favor the admission of highly qualified migrants. But still more it depends on world conditions of postwar economic and social dislocations, discriminations, and insecurities in various parts of the world that have disturbed social and occupational strata not normally disposed to emigrate and has attracted them to the greater political freedom and economic opportunity offered in the United States. Under present circumstances the United States has a rare opportunity to draw migrants of high intelligence and ability from abroad; and immigration, if well administered, can be one of our greatest national resources, a source of manpower and brainpower in a divided world.

It should be emphasized that there has been no relaxing of the qualitative criteria for admissibility to the United States, and that no relaxation of these mental, moral, economic, and ideological criteria is proposed in S. 1932 or H.R. 7700.

I urge you, Mr. Chairman and members of this committee, that you give most careful consideration to the President's proposals embodied in H.R. 7700 and S. 1932.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[From the New York Times, July 5, 1964]

CHANGE IN IMMIGRATION—PRESIDENT URGES EASING OF STRICTURES ON LETTING SKILLED SCIENTISTS STAY IN UNITED STATES

(By Howard A. Rusk, M.D.)

After hearing preliminary reports by a Subcommittee on Manpower, the President's Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke took its first official action last Tuesday.

It issued a resolution urging a change in immigration laws to facilitate immigration of highly skilled health research specialists.

Each year several thousand research scientists from abroad come to the United States on visitors' exchange visas. Such persons can stay in the United States only 5 years.

Should they wish to emigrate to the United States and take up permanent residence, they must leave the country and not reenter for 2 years.

The action of the President's Commission was taken the day before hearings were to begin in the House Judiciary Committee to amend the immigration laws.

One of the proposed changes would permit increased numbers of highly skilled persons to immigrate into the United States.

The committee is headed by Representative MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, Democrat, of Ohio.

A KENNEDY MEASURE

The bill being considered is an administration proposal introduced by Representative EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat, of Brooklyn, at President Kennedy's request a year ago. It was reintroduced in January at the request of President Johnson.

The bill would establish an immigration board that would make continuous studies of such conditions within and without the United States that might have any bearing on our Nation's immigration policies.

After consultation with the appropriate Government agencies, the board could recommend changes in admission policies to the Attorney General.

The bill specifically mentions consultations with the Secretaries of Labor, State, and Defense, but for some strange reason does not include the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Inclusion of the latter is particularly important if the objectives recommended by the President's Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke are to be realized.

THE CURRENT POLICY

Under current policies and procedures, foreigners in the United States on visitors' exchange visas may petition to be granted permanent visas.

The Department of Justice then asks the appropriate Government agency for its recommendations.

From 1957 to 1963, 985 such requests were acted upon by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Of these, 234 were persons holding positions in research and teaching in colleges and universities.

Six hundred eighty-five were physicians, most of whom were engaged in research or teaching.

Under the current policies and criteria, only 207 of these 985 applications could be approved.

This meant that many highly skilled research workers were forced to return to their own countries, where they lacked the facilities and equipment to continue their important research efforts.

ONE PROJECT HALTED

One distinguished professor of biochemistry told the President's Commission that his first assistant, who is engaged in a most promising highly sophisticated research project, will be forced to leave the country within the next few months.

Since he cannot be replaced by an American, the research project will come to a halt.

The scientist will either return home where he has no facilities, equipment or funds and waste his time or will emigrate to another country. Many such persons who are forced to leave the United States go to Canada.

This same story has been repeated many times since.

Under the new legislative proposals, such persons could be admitted to the United States on permanent visas.

It is because of this that the President's Commission unanimously adopted and forwarded to the President its resolution pointing out that "scientific research is of universal and international benefit."

THE RESOLUTION

The resolution continues:

"Contemporary research requires facilities and equipment of great cost as well as organization of great complexity.

"Such facilities and research environments are often more readily available in the United States than in other countries.

"Gifted scientists who are foreign nationals but who have received extensive training in the United States are normally compelled to return to their own countries to the considerable detriment of their careers, the loss of their potential scientific contribution, and to the permanent injury of the research on which they are engaged."

In view of this, the Commission recommended that foreign scientists and physicians of demonstrated accomplishment or recognized potential should be given indefinite extension of their visas.

It also recommended "that the immigration laws should be so revised as to facilitate the immigration and naturalization of scientists and physicians who can make special contributions to the intellectual resources of the Nation."

A MORE MODERN VIEW

The bill would also regard epilepsy, mental illness and mental retardation in a more modern light.

At present, it is impossible for a person with a history of any of these conditions to be admitted to the United States. This connotes an official Government attitude that such conditions are hopeless, which simply is not true in terms of modern medical knowledge.

The United Epilepsy Association, for example, reports that 50 percent of the estimated total of 1,854,000 persons in the United States with epilepsy are so amenable to modern medical treatment that all manifestations of their problem can be completely eliminated.

Medical science should have no international boundaries.

Highly skilled research workers should have the opportunity of conducting their studies in the best available environment.

Our present immigration policies by denying many this opportunity hinder the possibilities of research advances that might be of great value not only to our own Nation but also to the entire world.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I heartily subscribe to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Michigan. I, too, hope that individuals may be admitted to the United States upon the basis of worth, rather than upon the accident of birth, and that this may become our national policy.

REDISCOVERY OF RAILROAD TRAVEL

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I am always happy to note when people of authority—and in particular, men of the press—rediscover the railroad train. A few months ago I was able to call attention to an excellent and interesting article about a recent transcontinental train ride, written by Brooks Atkinson of the New York Times.

Today I am pleased to report that another distinguished columnist of the New York Times has stumbled upon the almost-forgotten mysteries of the Iron Horse. I refer to Russell Baker's column in the New York Times of Sunday, July 5, entitled "Westward With Pride of Pioneer."

Mr. Baker apparently has been participating in the current westward political migration of the news media, but he chose to make his trip, at least as far as Denver, by train. In the process he discovered some of the pleasures and satisfactions of traveling in comfort and relaxation close to the countryside, and he also discovered some of the drawbacks to rail travel which have kept passengers off the trains.

In a subsequent column on July 7, entitled "Encounter on the Oregon Trail," Mr. Baker reports some ironic observations on the second leg of his journey, from Colorado to Oregon, which was accomplished by a more common means of transportation, the automobile.

As an advocate of the rehabilitation of our railroads, I wish to commend Mr. Baker for his thoughtful, entertaining articles. We need more of the kind of rediscovery which Mr. Baker experienced if we are to bring commonsense and balance to the planning of our national transportation program.

In particular, I hope that we can start to achieve that commonsense and balance along the main arteries of travel of our crowded northeastern States. My pending bill, Senate Joint Resolution 18, authorizing an interstate authority to run high-speed rail transportation between Washington and Boston, would offer many people the opportunity, I believe, to rediscover the pleasures Mr. Baker describes. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD Mr. Baker's articles of July 5 and 7, 1964.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, July 5, 1964]

WESTWARD WITH PRIDE OF PIONEER

(By Russell Baker)

DENVER, July 4.—Here is a fascinating new idea in travel. It is called the train. It is marvelous. It hugs the earth and bears you along at one-tenth the speed of sound, with frequent stops to allow close scrutiny of the American landscape.

It is especially recommended for the ruling classes, who suffer from the delusion that being shot across the continent in a metal cylinder is the ultimate in fancy living.

A substantial train trip—as from Washington to Denver—takes two nights. Trains provide ingenious private rooms complete with plumbing and beds. Seasoned air travelers will be delighted to find that, once seated or reclining in these rooms, privacy is absolute.

Young women with glass smiles do not barge in to ask if a seatbelt is fastened, or to offer chewing gum, or to push coffee, tea, and milk.

AIR TRAVEL NERVES

The fast trains west out of Washington depart at teatime. There is no luggage weigh-in at the terminal and no psychic compulsion to buy $65,000 worth of life insurance before boarding, though the first few hours may put heavy strain on the person unaccustomed to train travel.

After half an hour—a period in which he would normally expect to be approaching Pittsburgh—he may start wandering the train nervously, asking how far it has gone. It will be just outside Silver Spring, Md., perhaps 20 miles beyond Washington.

As the evening wears on and the great diesels start their labored curve over the darkening Appalachians, he will discover the diner and the lounge and begin to notice features of America that are invisible from 30,000 feet. That the eastern countryside is carpeted with black-eyed susans. That country children still stand by railroad tracks to wave at people bound for Chicago.

ORDEAL IN CHICAGO

And then, with nightfall, the train is a cocoon of soft light rushing through the starred tunnel of night, its whistle baying at mountain towns. Over the rough Appalachian roadbed, the thing creaks and groans like a ship at sea, and in the black hours with a screech and jolt of brakes it wakes the sleeper to witness the fires of Pittsburgh.

With morning, it is racing across the Indiana flatlands and by breakfast it is gliding into the steel labyrinth of Chicago, already shimmering under a hot brass sky. It is still necessary to change trains to cross the Mississippi. The explanation is a mystery to all but railroad men. Hogs can cross the continent without changing trains, as someone used to say, but people can't.

The result is a day of toil. Baggage must be unloaded, shipped to another station, stored. Hours must be killed in Chicago. Nobody can say for certain how many hours, for the trains have their own time, and only mathematicians understand it.

In Chicago it is 98° in the shade. The streets are melting. One begins to curse the train. And, also to feel heroic about making such a hardship journey West.

TWO WHOLE DAYS

Back to the station through layers of heat for the night train to Denver. Get the baggage out of storage. Fight for a baggage cart. Then agony. The train leaves at 5 p.m., central standard time, and not 5 p.m., central daylight time. Another steaming hour to kill with the baggage. Do not ask why the trains refuse to operate on local time. It is a mystery, like why they force people to change in Chicago. The trains have their dignity. They do not put themselves out for people.

And then, at last, it is moving again through the dusk. Across the Mississippi and into Iowa and hurtling down across Nebraska, restoring serenity. By morning it is a new world of vast crystal sky and sagebrush, pounding toward the Rocky Mountains.

Fifty miles across the prairie, the peaks are still creased with snow. At Denver the air is hot, dry, and sparkling, and the westering man who could have made the whole trip in 5 hours by jet arrives with a sense of having made an expedition.

He has not merely been on an elevator ride. He has traveled, and he feels it. He has traveled, and he feels it. Two whole days from Washington to Denver. The pioneers couldn't have arrived with a greater sense of pride.

[From the New York Times, July 7, 1964]

ENCOUNTER ON THE OREGON TRAIL

(By Russell Baker)

PENDELTON, OREG., July 6.—Back down the road a piece, along the Snake River, there was a grizzled mirage standing in the sage brush. There was nothing to do but photograph him, but he was obviously uneasy and it was necessary to jolly him along with small talk.

"Hello, there, oldtimer. You're a mirage, aren't you?"

"Yup," he said.

"Lost?"

"I'm looking for the Oregon Trail," he said.

"You haven't seen the wagons along this way by any chance?"

"Well, you see, oldtimer, we don't travel by wagon train any more. Nowadays we have cars." He looked nonplused. "See that box sitting over there on wheels? That's a car. It goes 600 miles a day. When you people wanted to get to Oregon it took you 5 months from Missouri. We make it now in 3 days."

FOOD AND SNAPSHOTS

He whistled in disbelief. "What's it like?" he asked. "Traveling in one of those cars, I mean."